



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/500,919 | 07/08/2004 | Ramalinga Reddiar Shanmuga Raju | 20160.0001USWO | 8410 |
| 52835 7590 09/29/2008 HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C. P.O. BOX 2902 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| DENG, ANNA CHEN | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2191 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 09/29/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/500,919

Applicant(s)

RAJU ET AL.

Examiner

ANNA DENG

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to amendment filed on 6/11/2008.
2. Claims 1-9 have been cancelled.
3. Claims 10-17 have been added.
4. The objection to the drawing is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
5. The objection to the Specification is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
6. Claims 10-17 are pending.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 10-16 are rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 10 set forth a tool comprising a builder component, an executor engine component, that are not physical components (hardware) to constitute a machine or a manufacture under 101. In applicants' Specification, page 4, 4th paragraph, recites "wherein the said software tool, has two parts namely builder and executor engine" that clearly defined the tool is a software. Since claim 10 is not a process or a composition of matter, it appears to fail to fall within a statutory category and thus is non-statutory.

Claims 11-16 are rejected for failing to cure the deficiencies of the above rejected non-statutory claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 10-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Turner et al. US 6,230,309 B1 (hereinafter Turner), Applicant submitted IDS.

Claim 10 (New):

Turner discloses:

A tool for building an information system onto a computer-readable medium comprising (Turner, col. 4, lines 41-50, a design tool for assembling component objects to form an object-based computer system application, the design tool comprising):

a builder component that receives one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process, and creates a plurality of definitions using the one or more transaction structures and the one or more information views (Turner, col. 4, lines 41-67, a declarative user input

interface mechanism configured to be operable to provide an input structure for inputting user declaration specifying operative interactions between component object; and a design engine configured to be operable automatically to generate in response to input user declarations, an application design definition modeling an application infrastructure for managing component object interactions...the design engine is configured to be operable automatically to generate, in response to input user declarations, at least one application view definition for managing component object interaction, and to cause the application design definition to reference at least one application view definition. In this manner, a plurality of application definitions, each representing an application view);
and

an executor engine component that uses the plurality of definitions created by the builder component to assemble the information system at run time (Turner, col. 5, lines 20-37, the design engine is configured automatically to generate, in response to input user declarations, a match between the application view field definition and a parameter of an associated component object operation. These mechanisms facilitate the many-to-many linkages which are needed between objects to control information flow between those objects (assemble the information system)...a runtime tool comprising an application engine responsive to an application design definition modeling an application infrastructure for managing component object interactions, wherein the application engine is configured to be operable at runtime automatically to create application view instances from respective application view definitions for managing runtime component object interactions for the application. The

runtime tool is thereby able to interpret the application design definition in order to generate application view instances for managing runtime component object);

wherein after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any down time (Turner, for example, FIG. 7B, col. 15, lines 12-38, A Detail Operation Effect 68 is one which causes information about the current row in the Application View 80 to be refreshed or expanded...An Update Operation Effect 68 is one which causes values in the current row of an Application View 80 to be updated...An Add Row Operation Effect 68 is one which causes the used row property of the Application View 80 to be increased by one and values returned from Application View Field Matches 64 to be mapped into that new row. ...When an Add Row Operation Effect 68 is produced, it raises an "Expand" type Application View Event 70).

Per Claim 11 (New):

Turner discloses:

wherein each of the one or more transaction structures comprises one or more data containers, one or more input fields, one or more graphical user interface definitions, one or more validation statements, one or more process maps, or one or more print formats (Turner, for example, col. 2, lines 41-43, represent information from components to the end user of the application through the use of software routines and the provision of a graphical user interface; also, col. 5, line

66 through col. 6, line 10, there is provided a user interface configuration tool for automatically configuring a user interface based on an application design definition modeling an application infrastructure; col. 5, lines 4-10, in response to input user declarations, at least one application view field definition for detailing a field of the at least one application view definition. The application definition can, in this manner, be implemented as a table in database).

Per Claim 12 (New):

Turner discloses:

a database wherein the definitions created by the builder component are stored as definition data in the database and accessed by the executor engine component (Turner, for example, col. 21, lines 35-36, the information is stored in an Access database since Access databases have a high degree of interoperability with Visual Basic).

Per Claim 13 (New):

Turner discloses:

wherein after the information system is assembled, the builder component is capable of receiving the one or more additional transaction structures and/or the one or more additional information views and creating one or more additional definitions, and the executor engine component is capable of assembling the one or more additional definitions created by the builder component to modify and

expand the existing information system without any down time (Turner, for example, FIG. 7B, col. 15, lines 12-38, A Detail Operation Effect 68 is one which causes information about the current row in the Application View 80 to be refreshed or expanded...An Update Operation Effect 68 is one which causes values in the current row of an Application View 80 to be updated...An Add Row Operation Effect 68 is one which causes the used row property of the Application View 80 to be increased by one and values returned from Application View Field Matches 64 to be mapped into that new row. ...When an Add Row Operation Effect 68 is produced, it raises an "Expand" type Application View Event 70).

Per Claim 14 (New):

Turner discloses:

wherein the executor engine component comprises: a process request server that processes one or more transaction or information requests (Turner, for example, col. 5, lines 39-65, the application engine is configured to operable at runtime to provide automated management of data values provided to operation and data values provided by operation when the operations are invoked by an application view instance...); **and**

a graphical user interface layer that presents a user interface of the information system to a user, receives one or more transaction or information requests, and submits the one or more transaction or information requests to the process request server (Turner, col. 2, lines 41-43, represent information from

components to the end user of the application through the use of software routines and the provision of a graphical user interface; also, col. 5, line 66 through col. 6, line 10, there is provided a user interface configuration tool for automatically configuring a user interface based on an application design definition modeling an application infrastructure ...).

Per Claim 16 (New):

Turner discloses:

wherein the one or more transaction structures, the one or more information views, the one or more additional transaction structures or the one or more additional information views is received via the Internet (Turner, FIG. 46, col. 40, lines 53-61, "FIG. 46 is a schematic representation of a multicomputer computing system comprising a plurality of computers C1, C2, C3, etc, connected via a network N...The network N can be any form of network, whether a LAM, WAM, or a loosely connected network via the Internet or the like").

Per Claim 17 (New):

This is method version of the claimed tool discussed above (claim 1), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner et al. US 6,230,309 B1 (hereinafter Turner), in view of Goodwin et al. US 6,199,195 B1 (hereinafter Goodwin), applicant submitted IDS.

Per Claim 15 (New):

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and further, Turner does not explicitly teach **wherein the information system is domain-neutral**. However, Goodwin teaches **wherein the information system is domain-neutral** (Goodwin, col. 12, lines 45-48, "The goal of the unified model is to describe high level application business objects that are familiar to developers. The meta data are object that describe the application business objects in a domain-independent matter").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify an unique versatile executor engine disclosed by Turner to include **wherein the information system is domain-neutral** using the teaching of Goodwin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to automatically generated source code objects within extensible object frameworks and links to enterprise resources as suggested by Goodwin (Goodwin, col. 1, lines 10-12).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 6/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued:

Turner and Goodwin, either alone or in combination, don not teach or suggest after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any down time.

Examiner response:

The combination of Turner and Goodwin, does teaches after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any down time (Turner, col. 4, lines 41-50, a design tool for assembling component objects to form an object-based computer system application, the design tool comprising, for example, FIG. 7B, col. 15, lines 12-38, A Detail Operation Effect 68 is one which causes information about the current row in the Application View 80 to be refreshed or expanded...An Update Operation Effect 68 is one which causes values in the current row of an Application View 80 to be updated...An Add Row Operation Effect 68 is one which causes the used row property of the Application View 80 to be

increased by one and values returned from Application View Field Matches 64 to be mapped into that new row. ...When an Add Row Operation Effect 68 is produced, it raises an "Expand" type Application View Event 70). Here, Turner clearly teaches assembling component objects to form an object-based computer system application (information system), the application can be updated (modified) by add/expand a row to the application views. Moreover, Turner teaches "the application engine is configured to be operable at runtime automatically (without any downtime) to create application view instances from respective application view definitions form managing runtime component object interactions for the application" (see col. 5, lines 31-34, also col. 6, 26-31). Therefore, the combination of Turner and Goodwin teaches all the limitations in the present application.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136 (a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anna Deng whose telephone number is 571-272-5989. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Anna Deng/

Examiner, Art Unit 2191

/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191